



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

such a contract cannot be said to rest in parol; that the wills, in equity, are not ambulatory, and may not be revoked by either party so long as the other party continues to perform the contract; and that where either party to such a contract commits a breach of same by subsequently executing another will devising his property contrary to the terms of the contract, the other party is entitled to specific performance. *Brown v. Webster*, 90 Neb. 591, 134 N. W. 185, 37 L. R. A. N. S. 1196.

WILLS—GIFTS PARTLY VOID.—Testator devised the residue of his estate to the town to use the income forever to care for testator's burial place, and the balance to support public schools. It was claimed that the whole gift was void because an uncertain part was to be devoted to a private purpose (care of a burial place) as to which a perpetual trust would be void. But the court found that \$3 a year would care for the burial place, reviewed the conflicting decisions as to the validity of trusts to maintain tombs in perpetuity, and succeeded in avoiding a decision on the point by holding the charitable trust to support the public schools was separable from the rest, or if not the whole might be devoted to the support of the public schools, charged with a "moral obligation" to maintain testator's tomb. *Smart v. Town of Durham*, (N. H. 1913), 86 Atl. 821.

In another recent case \$500 out of an estate of \$30,000 was given to St. Mary's Catholic Parish of Sterling in trust to keep testator's burial lot forever in repair and use the rest of the income in support of the parish school, and it was held that the whole gift was valid in view of the trifling amount of the bequest compared with the rest of the estate. *Burke v. Burke* (Ill. 1913), 102 N. E. 293. In this case contestants relied on the prior decisions of the court that trusts for perpetual care of a burial lot are void: *Mason v. Bloomington Lib. Assn.*, 237 Ill. 442, 85 N. E. 1044, 15 Ann. Cas. 603; and that the valid provisions of the will must be rejected with the invalid where the will manifests a connected plan destroyed by the invalidity of a part, where the good cannot be separated from the bad, or where enforcement of a part only would result in injustice. *Barrett v. Barrett*, 255 Ill. 332, 99 N. E. 625. The general rule is that the invalidity of a part of a gift or trust does not destroy the rest if the good can be separated from the bad, unless the result thereby produced is a disposition that the testator probably would not have made if he had known that part of his plan could not have effect. *Landram v. Jordan*, 203 U. S. 56, 27 Sup. Ct. 17; *Niles v. Mason*, 126 Mich. 482, 85 N. W. 1100; *Johnson v. Johnson* (Ky. 1904), 79 W. 293.

WILLS—TESTAMENTARY CAPACITY — SUFFICIENCY OF EVIDENCE.—The testator suffered at times from attacks of insanity, but all the witnesses present when the will was made, including the subscribing witnesses, a physician, and a nurse, testified that at the time of making the will the testator was of sound and disposing mind. The only evidence tending to prove mental incapacity was that the frequency of the attacks of dementia was increasing, and that before and after the will was executed the testator made declarations of intention contrary to that expressed in the will. *Held*, that at the time of